#### FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT MUR: 7457 DATE COMPLAINT FILED: 08/02/2018 DATE OF NOTIFICATION: 08/09/2018 LAST RESPONSE RECEIVED: 08/27/2018 **DATE ACTIVATED: 11/13/2018** 10 **ELECTION CYCLE: 2018** 11 EXPIRATION OF SOL: 07/09/2023 - 07/11/2023 12 13 Kevin Doering; Citizens for Turner 14 **COMPLAINANT:** 15 16 **RESPONDENTS:** Theresa Gasper Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in 17 18 her official capacity as treasurer 19 20 RELEVANT STATUTES 21 **AND REGULATIONS:** 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a) 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(b) 22 23 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(6) 24 25 **INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED:** Disclosure Reports 26 27 **AGENCIES CHECKED:** None 28 .29 I. INTRODUCTION 30 The Complaint alleges that congressional candidate Theresa Gasper and her campaign 31 32 committee, Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer 33 (the "Committee"), knowingly misrepresented in a campaign flyer that five universities endorsed 34 her campaign, in violation of the ban on corporate contributions in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). As discussed below, we'recommend that the 35 Commission find no reason to believe that Respondents violated 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a), and close 36 the file. 1. 37

The Complaint also alleges that actions taken by Respondents could jeopardize the tax-exempt status of the universities, an area of law not within the Commission's jurisdiction.

# II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Theresa Gasper was the 2018 Democratic nominee in Ohio's 10th Congressional

- 3 District.<sup>2</sup> The Committee is the principal campaign committee for her 2018 campaign.<sup>3</sup>
- 4 The Complaint alleges that Gasper knowingly and intentionally misrepresented that her
- 5 campaign was endorsed by five universities when it created and disseminated a fundraising
- 6 flyer. The flyer advertised a "higher education fundraiser in support of" Gasper on July 12,
- 7 2018, and identified a "Host Committee," listing the five universities, followed by the names of
- 8 individuals.<sup>5</sup> Each of the five universities are registered in Ohio as non-profit corporations<sup>6</sup> that
- 9 cannot engage in political activity.<sup>7</sup>

The Complaint alleges that by falsely implying that the five universities had endorsed

- 11 Gasper's campaign, the Respondents knowingly caused the Committee to receive prohibited in-
- 12 kind contributions from each university. The Complaint alleges that at least one of the
- universities issued a prior warning to the Respondents not to release the flyer, and that four of the
- 14 five universities ultimately repudiated the implied endorsement.<sup>9</sup>

See FEC Form 2, Amended Statement of Candidacy, Theresa Gasper (July 4, 2018).

See FEC Form 1, Amended Statement of Organization, Theresa Gasper for Congress (July 4, 2018).

Compl. at 1.

<sup>5</sup> Compl. at 7.

See Ohio Secretary of State Business Search, https://businesssearch.sos.state.oh.us/ (search "University of Dayton," "Wright State University," "Sinclair Community College," "Antioch University" and "Central State University.")

See 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) (providing tax exemption to a corporation that, among other things, does not participate in or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office).

<sup>8</sup> Compl. at 4-5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Id. at 3. The Complaint alleges that such repudiation occurred, for example, by some of the universities issuing cease and desist letters. Id.

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MUR 7457 (Theresa Gasper for Congress, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 3 of 5

In a joint response, Gasper and the Committee assert that the fourteen individuals on the host committee were identified according to the school where they were employed for purposes of brevity.<sup>10</sup> Respondents assert the flyer was used for approximately 24 hours, and then was replaced with a flyer that did not identify the universities, which Respondents provide in their

5 response. 11.

## III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Act and Commission regulations define "contribution" as "any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election for Federal office." "Anything of value" includes all in-kind contributions, defined as the provision of any goods or services without charge or at a charge that is less than the usual and normal charge for such goods or services. 13

Corporations are prohibited from making contributions or expenditures to candidates and their authorized committees. <sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, corporations are permitted to endorse candidates for office under the Act, as long as expenses for the endorsement are *de minimis* and the endorsement is not coordinated with the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee. <sup>15</sup>

The Committee's fundraising flyer may have been intended to imply that the five universities had endorsed Gasper's campaign, but the record provides no indication that the

Joint Resp. at 2.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 2, 5.

<sup>52</sup> U.S.C. § 30101(8)(A)(i); 11 C.F.R § 100.52(a); see also 52 U.S.C.§ 30118(b)(2) (defining "contribution" to include "any direct or indirect payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or any services, or anything of value . . . to any candidate, campaign committee, or political party or organization, in connection with any election to any of the offices referred to in this section.").

<sup>11</sup> C.F.R § 100.52(d)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a); 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(b).

See 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(6). See also Advisory Op. 1997-16 (Oregon Natural Resources Council) at 4.

MUR 7457 (Theresa Gasper for Congress, et al.) First General Counsel's Report Page 4 of 5

- 1 universities actually endorsed Gasper or that they coordinated with the Committee on the flyer so
- 2 that a prohibited, in-kind contribution could have occurred due to the implied endorsement in the
- 3 flyer. 16 Further, the flyer circulated for only 24 hours, after which it was replaced with a new
- 4 flyer that did not identify the universities, suggesting that any potential value would have been de
- 5 minimis.
- In light of these facts, we recommend that the Commission find no reason to believe that
- 7 Theresa Gasper and Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as
- 8 treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a), and close the file.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10 11
- 1. Find no reason to believe that Theresa Gasper and Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a);
- 12 13 14
- 2. Approve the attached Factual and Legal Analysis;
- 15
- 16 3. Approve the appropriate letters; and

1		
2	4. Close the file.	
3		
4		• •
5		Lisa J. Stevenson
6		Acting General Counsel
7		•
8		Charles Kitcher
9		Acting Associate General Counsel for Enforcement
10		
11		0, 01, 1, 2,11
12	March 15, 2019	Peter Blumberg by MA Peter Blumberg
13	Date	
14		Acting Deputy Associate General Counsel
15		•
16		Mark Allen
17		Mark Allen
18	•	Assistant General Counsel
19		
20		
21	Attachment	
22	Factual and Legal Analysis	

2

4 5

6

7 8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

## **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**RESPONDENTS:** 

Theresa Gasper

**MUR 7457** 

RESI GIVEENTS:

Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May

in her official capacity as treasurer

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Complaint alleges that congressional candidate Theresa Gasper and her campaign committee, Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer (the "Committee"), knowingly misrepresented in a campaign flyer that five universities endorsed her campaign, in violation of the ban on corporate contributions in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). As discussed below, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Respondents violated 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).

# II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Theresa Gasper was the 2018 Democratic nominee in Ohio's 10th Congressional District.<sup>2</sup> The Committee is the principal campaign committee for her 2018 campaign.<sup>3</sup>

The Complaint alleges that Gasper knowingly and intentionally misrepresented that her campaign was endorsed by five universities when it created and disseminated a fundraising flyer.<sup>4</sup> The flyer advertised a "higher education fundraiser in support of" Gasper on July 12, 2018, and identified a "Host Committee," listing the five universities, followed by the names of

The Complaint also alleges that actions taken by Respondents could jeopardize the tax-exempt status of the universities, an area of law not within the Commission's jurisdiction.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See FEC Form 2, Amended Statement of Candidacy, Theresa Gasper (July 4, 2018).

See FEC Form 1, Amended Statement of Organization, Theresa Gasper for Congress (July 4, 2018).

<sup>4</sup> Compl. at 1.

6

7

8

9

10

MUR 7457 (Theresa Gasper for Congress, et al.) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 2 of 4

1 individuals.<sup>5</sup> Each of the five universities are registered in Ohio as non-profit corporations<sup>6</sup> that

2 cannot engage in political activity.<sup>7</sup>

The Complaint alleges that by falsely implying that the five universities had endorsed

4 Gasper's campaign, the Respondents knowingly caused the Committee to receive prohibited in-

kind contributions from each university.<sup>8</sup> The Complaint alleges that at least one of the

universities issued a prior warning to the Respondents not to release the flyer, and that four of the

five universities ultimately repudiated the implied endorsement.9

In a joint response, Gasper and the Committee assert that the fourteen individuals on the host committee were identified according to the school where they were employed for purposes of brevity.<sup>10</sup> Respondents assert the flyer was used for approximately 24 hours, and then was replaced with a flyer that did not identify the universities, which Respondents provide in their

replaced with a flyer that did not identify the universities, which Respondents provide in their

12 response. 11

Compl. at 7.

See Ohio Secretary of State Business Search, https://businesssearch.sos.state.oh.us/ (search "University of Dayton," "Wright State University," "Sinclair Community College," "Antioch University," and "Central State University.")

See 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) (providing tax exemption to a corporation that, among other things, does not participate in or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Compl. at 4-5.

Id. at 3. The Complaint alleges that such repudiation occurred, for example, by some of the universities issuing cease and desist letters. Id.

Joint Resp. at 2.

<sup>11</sup> Id. at 2, 5.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MUR 7457 (Theresa Gasper for Congress, et al.) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 3 of 4

## III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

2 The Act and Commission regulations define "contribution" as "any gift, subscription,

3 loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of

4 influencing any election for Federal office." 12 "Anything of value" includes all in-kind

contributions, defined as the provision of any goods or services without charge or at a charge that

is less than the usual and normal charge for such goods or services. 13

Corporations are prohibited from making contributions or expenditures to candidates and their authorized committees. <sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, corporations are permitted to endorse candidates for office under the Act, as long as expenses for the endorsement are *de minimis* and the endorsement is not coordinated with the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee. <sup>15</sup>

The Committee's fundraising flyer may have been intended to imply that the five universities had endorsed Gasper's campaign, but the record provides no indication that the universities actually endorsed Gasper or that they coordinated with the Committee on the flyer so that a prohibited, in-kind contribution could have occurred due to the implied endorsement in the flyer. <sup>16</sup> Further, the flyer circulated for only 24 hours, after which it was replaced with a new flyer that did not identify the universities, suggesting that any potential value would have been de minimis.

<sup>52</sup> U.S.C. § 30101(8)(A)(i); 11 C.F.R § 100.52(a); see also 52 U.S.C.§ 30118(b)(2) (defining "contribution" to include "any direct or indirect payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or any services, or anything of value . . . to any candidate, campaign committee, or political party or organization, in connection with any election to any of the offices referred to in this section.").

<sup>11</sup> C.F.R § 100.52(d)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a); 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(b).

See 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(6). See also Advisory Op. 1997-16 (Oregon Natural Resources Council) at 4.

See 11 C.F.R. § 114.4(c)(6).

MUR 7457 (Theresa Gasper for Congress, et al.) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 4 of 4

- 1 In light of these facts, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Theresa Gasper and
- 2 Theresa Gasper for Congress and Jennifer May in her official capacity as treasurer violated
- 3 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).